

CALTEX (PHILIPPINES) INC., PETITIONER, VS. KATIPUNAN LABOR UNION, RESPONDENT.,*G.R. No. L-7496. January 31, 1956*

Ponente: LABRADOR, J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/0f7dadde962b/>**LABRADOR, J.:**

On June 24, 1953 the Court of Industrial Relations received a petition of the Katipunan Labor Union dated June 8, 1953 entitled "Caltex Cebu Branch vs. Katipunan Labor Union" and docketed as Case No. 430-V (1), alleging that employee Florencio Alforque of the respondent labor union has been dismissed by the petitioner without sufficient or valid cause and without an investigation, in violation of the order of the Court of Industrial Relations dated March 18, 1950, and praying that said Alforque be reinstated in his position with full pay from May 1, 1953, the date of his dismissal, to the date of his reinstatement. This petition was received in the Court of Industrial Relations after the approval of Republic Act No. 875 on June 17, 1953, although it was mailed prior to the said date of approval. The Caltex (Philippines) Inc. filed an answer alleging that Alforque lacks judgment, initiative and ability in his work as a mechanic; that the branch in which he worked is over-staffed and the services of Alforque were not needed; that case No. 430-V was terminated long before the petition was filed; and that the petition does not state facts to merit an exercise of jurisdiction by the Court of Industrial Relations. After hearing the Court declared it has jurisdiction over the case and ordered the provisional reinstatement of Alforque to his former position, pending hearing on the merits of the dismissal. A motion to reconsider the same was denied, so this present petition was filed in this court alleging that the Court of Industrial Relations has no jurisdiction over the case first, because the court lacks jurisdiction to order the reinstatement after the enactment of Republic Act No. 875; second, because only one employee, not 31 members, is involved; and, third, there is no labor dispute between the employer and the workers.

It appears that sometime in 1950, a labor dispute arose between the Katipunan Labor Union and the Caltex (Philippines) Inc. The case was docketed in the Court of Industrial Relations as case No. 430-V, "Caltex Cebu Branch vs. Katipunan Labor Union." The case was amicably settled on June 29, 1950, the court approving the settlement in an order issued on July 28, 1950. Among the terms of the amicable settlement was an agreement that "the company prior to any dismissal, lay-off or suspension should give the union opportunity to be heard and the union should be given not less than three (3) days notice before any hearing or investigation" is conducted. Failure of the Court of Industrial Relations for the reinstatement to comply with this agreement was the basis for the order of Alforque.

One of the reasons given why the Court of Industrial Relations is alleged to have no jurisdiction over the case is that the petition was received in the Court of Industrial Relations after Republic Act No. 875 was approved on June 17, 1953. In answer to this contention it is to be noted that it is the practice before courts of justice to consider the mails as an agent of the Government—so the date of mailing is always considered as the date of filing any petition, motion or paper. As the petition in the present case was mailed before the approval of Republic Act No. 875, it may not be considered filed after the new law had become effective.

The next contention is that the dismissal of the employee is not a labor dispute. This is without merit. The term labor dispute is defined as including

"* * * any controversy concerning terms, tenure or conditions of employment * * *" (Sec. 2[j], Republic Act No. 875).

The existing agreement between the Katipunan Labor Union and the petitioner, that no employee should be dismissed without notice and an opportunity for hearing, is a condition or term of the employment agreement. The enforcement of the agreement is not the concern of the employee affected alone, but that of the whole labor union to which he belongs; there is labor dispute because there is controversy between the union and the employer regarding it.

Another argument of petitioner is that the agreement in question, entered into in the year 1950, .only terminated the case then existing, and it or the decision rendered thereon is not applicable three (3) years thereafter. This contention is not justified by the very terms of the agreement itself, which clearly contemplate future relationship between the parties. As the relationship of employer and employee continued to exist without any change or modification of the agreement, the parties are presumed to have continued under its terms.

We find no merit in the petition and we hereby deny it with costs against the petitioner.

Parás, C. J., Padilla, Reyes, A., Bautista Angelo, Concepcion, Reyes, J. B. L., and Endencia, JJ., concur.

ABOUT BATAS.ORG

Study smarter at BATAS.org

The Philippine bar review and law-school companion built around how your brain actually remembers.

The complete Philippine law library - free for everyone.

More than 100,000 Supreme Court decisions, Republic Acts, and executive issuances - full-text searchable, browsable by category and year, and always free. No paywall, no login. This PDF came from it.

Audio case-brief lectures.

Any decision becomes a podcast-style lecture - facts, issues, ruling, and doctrine - with read-along highlighting and a hands-free presentation mode. Study while commuting, working out, or resting your eyes.

Bar review built on the science of memory.

Complete, sequenced courses for all eight bar subjects, narrated like podcasts and reinforced with retrieval practice and spaced review - the study techniques with the strongest evidence behind them.

The full law-school curriculum.

One subscription unlocks the entire J.D. curriculum - every subject, every lesson, with your progress tracked down to the paragraph so you can pick up exactly where you left off, on any device.

Mock exams that tell you where you stand.

Timed multiple-choice exams graded instantly, with per-subject score breakdowns and focus suggestions that point you at your weakest topics first.

A study planner that keeps you on pace.

Set your schedule and BATAS tells you every day whether you are on track for bar day - and exactly which lesson to take next.

Start free at <https://batas.org>

The law library is free forever - and your first lesson is one click away.

The text of this document is an official public record and remains in the public domain. Formatting, presentation, and compilation © 2026 batas.org.

Downloaded free from the batas.org Law Library. Share it freely - the library is free for every law student, bar reviewee, and practitioner.